IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

ROBERT SCOTT,

Plaintiff, vs.

CITY OF CHICAGO, OFFICER SHARON CHRISTMAS, STAR No. 31589; OFFICER ANITA QUICK, STAR No. 38483; OFFICER STAR No. 17308; AND OFFICER MITCHELL, STAR No. 10637;

Defendants

DSC 3865 JUNGE SHADUR

MAGISTRATE JUDGE DENLOW

COMPLAINT AT LAW

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, ROBERT SCOTT, by and through his attorney, the LAW OFFICES OF BLAKE HORWITZ, and for his Complaint at Law, against the Defendants, CITY OF CHICAGO, OFFICER SHARON CHRISTMAS, STAR No. 31589; OFFICER ANITA QUICK, STAR No. 38483; OFFICER STAR No. 17308; AND OFFICER MITCHELL, STAR No. 10637; (hereinafter "DEFENDANT OFFICERS") and states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. The jurisdiction of the court is invoked pursuant to the Civil Rights Act, 42

U.S.C. §1981 and §1983; the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §1331 and 1343(a); the

Constitution of the United States; and supplementary jurisdiction, as codified in 28

DOCKETEI

U.S.C. §1367(a).

PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff, ROBERT SCOTT, is a citizen of the State of Illinois, and a citizen of the United States.
- 3. DEFENDANT OFFICERS were at all times relevant to this complaint duly appointed and sworn police officers for the CITY OF CHICAGO.
- 4. DEFENDANT OFFICERS engaged in the conduct complained of in the course and scope of their employment and while they were on duty. They are sued in their individual capacities.
- 5. The CITY OF CHICAGO is a duly incorporated municipal corporation and is the employer and principal of DEFENDANT OFFICERS. At all times material to this complaint, DEFENDANT OFFICERS were acting under color of state law, ordinance and/or regulation, statutes, customs and usages of the CITY OF CHICAGO.

FACTS

- 6. On or about OCTOBER 24th, 2001, the Plaintiff was stopped by DEFENDANT OFFICERS, in the City of Chicago.
 - 7. After the Plaintiff was stopped by said officers, he was handcuffed.
- 8. Defendant officer(s) pushed and caused him to collide his head into a metal structure, causing serious injuries.
- 9. On OCTOBER 24TH, 2001, the Plaintiff did not resist arrest and/or batter either of the DEFENDANT OFFICERS.
- 10. On OCTOBER 24TH, 2001, the Plaintiff did not obstruct justice and/or assault either of the DEFENDANT OFFICERS.

- 11. On OCTOBER 24TH, 2001 and/or any time thereafter, the DEFENDANT OFFICERS did not charge the Plaintiff with obstruction of justice, battery, assault and/or disorderly conduct.
- 12. On OCTOBER 24TH, 2001, and/or any time thereafter, the DEFENDANT OFFICERS did not charge the Plaintiff with a criminal offense other than that which relates to travelling at a rate over the speed limit.
- 13. At no time on OCTOBER 24TH, 2001, had the Plaintiff caused injury to either of the DEFENDANT OFFICERS.
- 14. The use of force initiated by the DEFENDANT OFFICERS and the failure to intervene in the use of said force, caused an excessive amount of force to be inflicted onto the body of the Plaintiff. Said force was unreasonable and unnecessary.
- 15. As a direct and proximate result of one or more of the aforesaid acts or omissions of the defendants, plaintiff was caused to suffer serious and permanent personal injury pain, suffering and mental anguish both now and in the future.

COUNT I (§1983 Excessive Use of Force)

- 16. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 15.
- 17. The actions of the DEFENDANT OFFICERS amount to an excessive use of force onto the Plaintiff. This conduct violated the Plaintiffs' Fourth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable seizure.
- 18. The aforementioned actions of said officers was the direct and proximate cause of the constitutional violations set forth above.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands compensatory damages, jointly and severally, from the DEFENDANT OFFICERS. Plaintiff also demands punitive damages, costs and attorney's fees against said Defendants. Plaintiff also demands whatever additional relief this Court deems equitable and just.

COUNT II (745 ILCS 10/9-102 Claim Against CITY OF CHICAGO)

- 19. Plaintiff re-allege paragraphs 1 through 18.
- 20. Defendant CITY OF CHICAGO is the employer of DEFENDANT OFFICERS.
- 21. DEFENDANT OFFICERS committed the acts alleged above under color of law and in the scope of their employment as employees of the CITY OF CHICAGO.

WHEREFORE, should DEFENDANT OFFICERS be found liable for the acts alleged above, Plaintiff demands that, pursuant to 745 ILCS 10/9-102, the CITY OF CHICAGO pay them any judgment Plaintiff obtains against DEFENDANT OFFICERS as a result of this complaint.

COUNT III MONELL CLAIM AGAINST THE CITY OF CHICAGO

- 22. The Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 15 as though fully set forth herein.
- 23. It is the custom, practice and policy of police officers and/or there supervisors/agents and/or other employees of the City of Chicago to perform the following acts and/or omissions in connection with excessive force complaints that are directed at Chicago police officers:

- a. Supervisory individuals from the City of Chicago fail to properly discipline City of Chicago police officers that have committed an act of excessive force upon another;
- b. Supervisory individuals from the City of Chicago fail to properly investigate a complaint of excessive force perpetrated by a City of Chicago Police Officer, upon another;
- c. Supervisory individuals from the City of Chicago fail to take proper remedial action against a City of Chicago Police officer once it is determined that he/she has committed an act of excessive force upon another.
- As a result of the misconduct undertaken by the City of Chicago, through it employees, the Plaintiff suffered serious injuries, as the custom, practice and policy of the City of Chicago permits and/or makes conducive to City of Chicago police officers, the type of conduct that occurred in the instant cause, as alleged in this complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against the City of Chicago, plus attorney's fees and costs. Plaintiff also demands whatever additional relief this Court deems equitable and just.

Respectfully Submitted.

Attorney for the Plaintiff

Blake Horwitz

Plaintiff demand trial by jury on all counts.

Attorney for the Plaintiff

Blake Horwitz

LAW OFFICES OF BLAKE HORWITZ Blake Horwitz, Esq. 155 N. Michigan, #714 Chicago, IL 60601 (312) 616-4433

S JS 44 (Rev. 3/99)	Val 2	ĮVIL COVE	R SHE	ET	\sim	
The JS-44 civil cover sheet by law, except as provided use of the Clerk of Court fo	by local rules of court.	This form, approved	l by the Jud	licial Conference of t E INSTRUCTIONS (the United States in Septer ON THE REVERSE OF 1	gs or other papers as required mber 1974, is required for the CHE FORM.)
(a) PLAINTIFFS Robert Scott				Christmas Officer #1	TS City of Chic +31589; Officer 1 7308; Officer 1	igs Officer cer Quick, #38483 Mitchell, #10637
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff				County of Reside	nce of First Listed (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASI D CONDEMNATION CASES, U	Cook ES ONLY)
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nam Law Offices 155 N. Mic 312 - 616	L Blake 1	Horvitt	60601 MAGIS	JUDGE'S	MADUR OW	OCKETED OF 2002
II. BASIS OF JURISD		in One Box Only)	III. CII	TZENSHIP OF P Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif and One Box for Defendant)
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	► 3 Federal Question (U.S. Governm	nent Not a Party)	Citize	PTI en of This State	1 to Incorporated or	PTF DEF Principal Place
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citiz in Item III)	enship of Parties	Citìze	en of Another State	of Business i	Principal Place 5 5:
INC. NATION OF SHIP	T (D) "V" : () as Day Oaks)		en or Subject of a ceign Country	3 □ 3 Foreign Nation	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		RTS	FOR	FEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Inj.	PERSONAL INJUI 362 Personal Injury— Med. Malpractic 365 Personal Injury— Product Liability 368 Asbestos Person Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPEL 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damag 385 Property Damag Product Liability		10 Agriculture 20 Other Food & Drug 25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck 50 Airtine Regs. 60 Occupational Safety/Health 90 Other LABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Memyt, Relations	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. ☐ 460 Deportation ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 810 Selective Service ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange ☐ 12 USC 3410 ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 892 Ecomomic Stabilization Act ☐ 893 Environmental Matters
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITI	IONS	20 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of
□ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations ☐ 444 Welfare 240 Other Civil Rights	☐ 510 Motions to Vaca Sentence Habeas Corpus: ☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 540 Mandantus & O ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition	ate G 7	30 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act 40 Railway Labor Act 90 Other Labor Litigation 91 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	B65 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS B70 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) B71 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	Information Act ☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
V. ORIGIN (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) Appeal to District						
Original 2 Removed from Appellate Court Reopened Transferred from Appellate Court Reopened State Court Appellate Court Reopened Transferred from another district (specify) I 6 Multidistrict 5 Appellate Court (specify) Judgment						
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing and write brief statement of cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity.) Police Misconduck 42 use 1981 + 1989; 28 use 1331 + 1343(a)						
VII. REQUESTED IN ☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: Yes ☐ No						
VIII. This case	is not a refiling of a is a refiling of case	previously dismi		on. previously dismi:	ssed by Judge	0/
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD						
6/5/03		A				\ /